27

28

(1) <u>Jurisdiction and Service</u>:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Pro..

Plaintiff has attempted to serve Bumbo Pty in South Africa and Texas. Bumbo PTY Limited has specially appeared to file a Motion to Quash Service and Dismiss for Improper Service, Lack of Personal Jurisdiction and Failure to Serve. An Opposition to the Motion by plaintiff and a Reply brief by Bumbo Pty has been submitted and the court has taken the matter under consideration.

(2) A Brief Description Of The Events Underlying The Action:

The case is essentially one of product liability surrounding the safety of the Bumbo Baby Sitter – a foam seat designed to hold infants before they are strong enough to sit up on their own.

(3) Motions:

While the Parties are not in a position to anticipate every possible pre-trial motion as they are still in a very preliminary stage in the litigation, they anticipate motions relating to discovery issues, especially as they relate to documents maintained by the unanswered Bumbo defendants.

(4) <u>Amendment of Pleadings</u>:

Plaintiffs may amend the complaint to name Bumbo International.

(5) <u>Evidence Preservation</u>:

Plaintiffs requested that Defendant Target preserve their data regarding their gift registry, as the Bumbo product in question was purchased at a Target store as a result of the Plaintiffs' participation in the Target gift registry. This has been done.

(6) <u>Disclosures</u>:

The Parties have exchanged initial disclosures under Rule 26, Fed. R. Civ.

(7) <u>Discovery</u>:

Defendant Target has propounded interrogatories and request for

production of documents to Plaintiffs regarding the nature and extent of injuries.
Defendants are also attempting to arrange for a service to copy interviews given by

plaintiff to the press saved on their home TIVO system.

(8) Related Cases:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

This case has been related to *Wendy Whitson v. Bumbo, et al.*, a class action lawsuit relating to the purchase of the product. Defendant Target has filed a Motion to Dismiss certain claims in Plaintiff's complaint as failing to articulate cognizable claims that are sustainable as a nationwide class action. The court has taken this motion under consideration.

Plaintiff has served Bumbo in Texas and thereafter filed a Notice of Default. Bumbo (Pty) Limited has specially appeared and filed a Motion to Set Aside the Default, Quash Service, Dismiss for Improper Service, Lack of Personal Jurisdiction and Failure to Serve, and for Sanctions. Plaintiff also served Bumbo Pty Limited in South Africal. Bumbo (Pty) Limited filed a motion to quash that service. These motions were also taken under consideration.

(9) Relief:

Plaintiffs seek personal injury damages (economic and non-economic) as well as injunctive relief.

Defendant seeks dismissal of the action and its costs of suit.

(10) <u>Settlement and ADR</u>:

Plaintiffs and Target have agreed to mediation.

(11) Consent To Magistrate Judge For All Purposes:

Plaintiff does not so consent.

(12) Other References:

The Parties propose no other references at this time.

(13) Narrowing of Issues:

The Parties are committed to narrowing the issues as much as possible, and will meet and confer regarding same.

1		(14)	Expedited Sched	<u>le</u> :				
2	Given the difficulty with service of the Bumbo defendants the parties do not							
3	believe expedited scheduling is appropriate.							
4		(15)	Scheduling:					
5	The parties request that scheduling of discovery and pretrial deadlines							
6	should be postponed until service of the Bumbo defendants is completed and							
7	appearances have been made.							
8		(16)	<u>Trial</u> :					
9	Plaintiffs and Target have requested a jury trial. The Parties estimate a							
0	12-15 day jury trial.							
1	(18)	Disclo	sure Of Non-Party	Interested Entiti	ies Or Pers	sons:		
2		There	e are no non-party	interested pers	sons know	vn to the Plainti	ffs or	
3	Target.							
4	DATED: April 25, 2008			Respectfull	Respectfully submitted,			
5				EDGAR L	AW FIRM			
16								
17				Ву:	/s/	C EDGAD		
18					DONALD S JEREMY F			
19				Attorneys	for Plaintiff	S		
20								
21	DATED: April 25, 2008			Respectfu	Respectfully submitted,			
22								
23								
24				By:		L for		
25						RABISH ()		
26				Attorneys	for Defend	ant rarget		
27								
28								
			-3-					

Case 3:07-cv-04807-MHP Document 59 Filed 04/25/2008 Page 4 of 5

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (28 U.S.C. §1746)

I am employed in the County of Alameda, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. My business address is 555 12th Street, Suite 1800. P. O. Box 12925, Oakland, California 94604-2925.

I am readily familiar with the business practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. On the date indicated below, at the above-referenced business location, I sealed envelopes, enclosing a copy of the JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE STATEMENT, addressed as shown below, and placed them for collection and mailing following ordinary business practices to be deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below:

Donald S. Edgar, Esq. Jeremy R. Fietz, Esq. Rex Grady, Esq. Edgar LawFirm 408 College Avenue Santa Rosa, CA 95401 (707) 545-3200 Phone (707) 578-3040 Fax jeremy@classattorneys.com Jennifer J. Johnston, Esq. Rod S. Margo, Esq. Condon & Forsyth LLP 1901 Avenue of the Stars Suite 850 Los Angeles, CA 90067-6010 310-557-2030 310-557-1299 (fax) iiohnston@condonlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Attorneys for Defendant Bumbo (PTY) Ltd

Alexine Braun

25131\431357

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27